

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Γ	APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	10/812,642			Nikos Pagratis	NEX87/C2	5220	
	25871				EXAMINER		
	SWANSON	SWANSON & BRATSCHUN L.L.C.				VIVLEMORE, TRACY ANN	
	1745 SHEA	1745 SHEA CENTER DRIVE					
	SUITE 330				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	HIGHLAND	HIGHLANDS RANCH, CO 80129			1635		

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<del></del>	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
	10/812,642	PAGRATIS ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Tracy Vivlemore	1635						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Th  3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow	Responsive to communication(s) filed on  This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) 2, 8 and 14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da  5) Notice of Informal P  6) Other:							

# DETAILED ACTION

#### Election/Restrictions

## Restriction to a single nucleotide sequence

Claims 2, 8, and 14 are subject to restriction since they are not considered to be a proper genus/Markush. See MPEP 803.02 - PRACTICE RE MARKUSH-TYPE CLAIMS - If the members of the Markush group are sufficiently few in number or so closely related that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine all the members of the Markush group in the claim on the merits, even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. In such a case, the examiner will not follow the procedure described below and will not require restriction. Since the decisions in In re Weber, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978) and In re Haas, 580 F.2d 461, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention. In re Harnish, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and Ex parte Hozumi, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1)share a common utility, and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility.

Claims 2, 8 and 14 specifically claim multiple TGFβ2 nucleic acid ligand SEQ ID NOS, which are targeted to and bind TGFβ2. Although the sequences claimed each

Art Unit: 1635

share a common utility of targeting and binding to TGFβ2, the instant sequences are considered to be unrelated since each sequence claimed is independent and distinct due to its unique nucleotide sequence; they do not share a substantial feature related to this utility. As such the Markush/genus of sequences in claims 2, 8 and 14 is not considered to constitute a proper genus, and is therefore subject to restriction.

Furthermore, a search of more than one (1) of the sequences claimed in claims 2, 8 and 14 presents an undue burden on the Patent and Trademark Office due to the complex nature of the search in terms of computer time needed to perform the search and the subsequent analysis of the search results by the examiner. In view of the foregoing, one (1) sequence is considered to be a reasonable number of sequences for examination. Accordingly, applicants are required to elect one (1) sequence from claims 2, 8 and 14. Note that this is not a species election.

Claims 1, 7 and 13 link(s) the inventions in claims 2, 8 and 14. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 1, 7 and 13. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1635

Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. In re Ziegler, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracy Vivlemore whose telephone number is 571-272-2914. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:45-5:15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on 571-272-0811. The central FAX Number

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now Application/Control Number: 10/812,642

Art Unit: 1635

contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance.

Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight

(EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your

application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image

problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent

Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within

5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has

been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service

center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system

provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It

also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file

folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-

786-9199.

Tracy Vivlemore Examiner

Art Unit 1635

TV

October 4, 2005

Page 5